

Appl. No. 10/585903
Reply to Office Action dated 6/22/2009

Remarks

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1 and 3 have been amended to include the features of claim 5. Claim 5 has been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1-4 remain pending.

Prior Art Rejections

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Akira et al. (JP Publication 9-197394) or Stadtmueller (U.S. 5,891,297). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to a film peeling method for a display panel, in which a motor roller, having a self-rotating function, is adjacent to or in contact with a panel face of the display panel and is rotationally driven to peel off the film from the display panel. A benefit of the method claimed is that the self-rotating motor roller applies the driving force of the motor directly to the whole roller. Therefore, the peeling force of the roller is applied to the film evenly along the length of the roller, which promotes peeling off the film that is firmly stuck on the display panel.

Akira discloses a polarizing plate peeling device including a winding roller 4 for winding up a polarizing plate 1, a pressure sensitive adhesive double coated tape 6 for fixing the end of the polarizing plate 1, and a motor 5 for rotationally driving the winding roller 4. In this device, the winding roller 4 and the motor 5 are separate components with the motor being attached to a frame 5a that is fixed to a base 9 (FIG. 1 and para. [0015]), unlike the self-rotating motor roller of claim 1. When the motor of Akira is driven, the rotatory power is transmitted to the winding roller 4, which then rotates to wind up the polarizing plate 1 (FIG. 1). Because the motor 5 of Akira is positioned at one end of the roller 4, there is a difference in the transmission of the driving force of the motor 5 between the end of the roller 4 that is adjacent the motor 5 and the end that is opposite the motor 5. This makes it difficult to peel off the polarizing plate that has been firmly stuck on the liquid crystal panel 2.

Appl. No. 10/585903
Reply to Office Action dated 6/22/2009

Stadtmueller discloses a polarizing film peeling device including a roller 26 for peeling off a polarizing film 28 from a corner of the film, a slot 16 for engaging the polarizing film 28, and a handle 68 for driving the roller 26 (FIG. 1b and 4). The roller 26 and handle 68 are separate components, unlike the self-rotating motor roller of claim 1. When the handle 68 is turned manually, the rotatory power is transmitted to the roller 26, which then rotates to wind up the polarizing film 28. Because the handle 68 is positioned at one end of the roller 26, there is a difference in the transmission of the driving force between the end of the roller 26 that is adjacent the handle 68 and the end that is opposite the handle 68. Therefore, the peeling force of the roller 26 will not be applied to the polarizing film 28 evenly, which makes it difficult to peel off the polarizing film 28. In addition, the handle 68 is operated by hand, providing manual rotatory power to the roller 26. Therefore, the roller 26 is not a motor roller that has a self-rotating function as required in claim 1. Stadtmueller has no disclosure or suggestion of a motor or of self-rotation of the roller 26.

Therefore, Akira and Stadtmueller do not disclose or suggest the features of claim 1 and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Obviousness Rejections

Claims 2, 3 and 5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akira et al. (JP Publication 9-197394) in view of Mizutani et al. (U.S. 6,258,666). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 2 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependence on independent claim 1 and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Applicants do not concede the correctness of the rejection.

Claim 3 is directed to a film peeling device for a display panel, where the effective length of the rotationally drivable roller is longer than the short side of a display panel. The device has a contact plate disposed such that it fits closely with the surface of the roller, and a mechanism that presses the contact plate against the surface of the roller. The roller is a motor roller, with a self-rotating function. A benefit of the closely fitted contact plate and roller surface incorporating a pressing mechanism is that the end of the film 11 is grasped by the contact plate 4 and the face of the motor roller 3 (page 7, lines

Appl. No. 10/585903
Reply to Office Action dated 6/22/2009

25-27). A benefit of the self-rotating motor roller is that the driving force of the motor is directly transmitted to the whole roller. Therefore, the peeling force of the roller is applied to the film evenly along the length of the roller which promotes peeling off the film that is firmly stuck on the display panel.

Akira discloses a roller having an effective length longer than the short side of the display panel. However, Akira does not disclose a contact plate. Additionally, as discussed in the rejection above, the winding roller 4 and the motor 5, of Akira, are separate components, unlike the self-rotating motor roller of claim 1. And, because the motor 5 of Akira is positioned at one end of the roller 4, there is a difference in the transmission of the driving force of the motor 5 between the end of the roller 4 that is adjacent the motor 5 and the end that is opposite the motor 5. Therefore, the peeling force of the roller 4 will not be applied to the polarizing plate 1 evenly, as it will be with the claimed self-rotating motor roller, and it is difficult to peel off the polarizing plate that has been firmly stuck on the liquid crystal panel 2.

Mizutani does not disclose rotationally driving the thin film support member 5 with a motor. Mizutani does not disclose using a roller to wind up the thin film in a superimposed state as done with the self-rotating motor roller of the present application. Mizutani peels the semiconductor thin film away by half-rotating the thin film support member 5. Furthermore, Mizutani discloses a semiconductor thin film peeling device and seeks to avoid damage to the semiconductor thin film, which has properties different from those of the polarizing film and is damaged quite easily. This environment is not suitable for motor rollers and therefore the teachings of Mizutani would not be relevant to an apparatus using a motor roller. One skilled in the art would not look to Mizutani in attempting to arrive at the invention of claim 3. Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn for the foregoing reasons.

Applicants have canceled claim 5 and have included the features of claim 5 in claim 3. The rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Applicants do not concede the correctness of the rejection.

Appl. No. 10/585903
Reply to Office Action dated 6/22/2009

Claims 2 and 3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stadtmueller (U.S. 5,891,297) in view of Mizutani et al. (U.S. 6,258,666). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 2 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependence on independent claim 1 and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Applicants do not concede the correctness of the rejection.

Claim 3 is directed to a film peeling device for a display panel, where the effective length of the rotationally drivable roller is longer than the short side of a display panel. The device has a contact plate disposed such that it fits closely with the surface of the roller, and a mechanism that presses the contact plate against the surface of the roller. The roller is a motor roller, with a self-rotating function.

As discussed above, neither Stadtmueller nor Mizutani discloses a self-rotating motor roller. In addition, Mizutani is from a different technical field so one skilled in the art would not look to Mizutani in attempting to arrive at the invention of claim 3. Therefore, Mizutani does not remedy the deficiencies of Stadtmueller and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Akira et al. (JP Publication 9-197394) or Stadtmueller (U.S. 5,891,297) in view of Mizutani et al. (U.S. 6,258,666) as applied to claim 3 and further in view of McQuiston (U.S. 3,830,441). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 4 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependence on independent claim 3 and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Applicants do not concede the correctness of the rejection.

Information Disclosure Statement

It is noted that foreign patent document, CN2052140, was not considered at the time of the Office Action. A telephone conference was held between the undersigned attorney-of-record and the Examiner on August 24, 2009 in which the Examiner confirmed that the reference had not appeared in the Examiner's system at the time of

Appl. No. 10/585903
Reply to Office Action dated 6/22/2009

preparation of the Office Action, but is now available. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider this reference.

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.



Dated: September 18 2009

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &
LARSON, P.C.
P.O. Box 2902
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902
(612) 455-3800

By: 

Douglas P. Mueller
Reg. No. 30,300
DPM/lf/jls